

is when executives have millions in deferred compensation and other executive benefits that have been funded by tax-preferred vehicles like corporate owned life insurance none of which is available to the workers. If a benefit does not meet non-discrimination rules, it is unclear to me why a company should be able to fund these executive benefits through tax-preferred chicanery.

As we move into the 21st century it is important that we take note of the state of our private retirement system and work to improve it. Too many Americans still do not have any pension or retirement coverage. That must improve. We must also strengthen our retirement system to provide employees with real protections for their retirement savings—not symbolic changes as proposed by the House and Administration. We must provide our workers with increased pension portability and true ownership of all their retirement assets. Finally, we must change our laws so that companies are not able to take advantage of loopholes in the Tax Code that give them significant tax relief when funding executive retirement benefits that are not available to the workers. We will need much than proposed by the administration and passed by the House if we want a world where “what’s fair on the top floor should be fair on the shop floor.” I hope my colleagues from across the aisle are ready to match legislation with their rhetoric. If not, unfortunately, this Congress will come to a close with workers once again getting the short end of the bargain.

These are very important issues. When we return after this week-long recess, I hope we can put some serious effort into dealing with them. I commit to proposing some legislation to try to help move us in that direction.

My time has expired, so I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

ANDEAN TRADE PREFERENCE EXPANSION ACT—Continued

Ms. SNOWE. Madam President, I rise today to speak in support of the compromise trade package that is now before the Senate and to praise both sides for recognizing the need of retaining the linkage of trade promotion authority (TPA) and trade adjustment assistance (TAA) during floor consideration.

I would first like to commend Chairman BAUCUS and Ranking Member GRASSLEY for their efforts in crafting this package.

Not only have they worked in a bipartisan manner to ensure that it is the product of principled compromise, but they have also sought to ensure that many of my concerns regarding the deficiencies of past extensions of trade authority—most notably, a lack of accountability and consideration of the needs of small businesses—have been addressed. In the same manner,

both agreed to a critical expansion of the existing TAA program while also including provisions I advocated to accelerate assistance to dislocated workers and provide them with greater options in the utilization of these benefits.

I would also like to thank Senator BAUCUS and Senator GRASSLEY for their tenacity as we worked through the health care provisions in the TAA package during the last four weeks. Their commitment to this effort made it possible for the three of us to develop this agreement, and while both sides have made significant concessions to finalize this deal, we believe these health care provisions are a solid contribution to the TAA package.

At the beginning of the TPA-TAA debate in the Senate, everyone believed the fight over health care would doom Senate passage, but together we have proved them wrong. On that note, I would also like to commend the staff of both Senator BAUCUS and Senator GRASSLEY who worked so hard to develop this compromise against tremendous odds.

The Finance Committee has been working on the TPA and TAA legislation for nearly a year now, and, as a member of that committee, I have been extensively involved in its development. Through hearings and markups, along with numerous discussions, we have extensively debated this legislation—and will likely continue to do so until the final vote.

My decision to support this package, and the TPA section in particular, was by no means a foregone conclusion, as I have opposed trade agreements and fast-track authority in the past. I did so because I never felt they struck the proper balance between free and fair trade, and I have been concerned that both Republican and Democrat administrations approached the enforcement of U.S. trade laws not with vigor, but with benign neglect.

However, when the Finance Committee marked up this fast-track legislation in December, I supported it precisely because it does strike the appropriate balance, and because of this administration’s commitment to aggressively enforce our trade laws so that American workers aren’t undermined by unfair trade practices.

Furthermore, while some oppose linking TPA and TAA as contained in this trade package, my support is contingent on this linkage and I have repeatedly emphasized the importance of joining these proposals that are inextricably joined. TAA would not even exist if not for the fact that trade agreements impact U.S. jobs, so attempting to bifurcate TAA and TPA is like trying to divide the “heads” from the “tails” on a coin—sure, it may be possible, but the end product won’t be worth one red cent!

We must never forget that in the engagement of trade there is a downside—chiefly, that real lives are affected—people not just statistics. When

Americans become unemployed due to increased imports or plant relocations to other countries, it is because of trade agreements negotiated by the government of the United States and passed by Congress. Therefore, we have no obligation to also work toward forging a system that provides these trade-impacted Americans with the new skills needed to gain new employment.

And lest anyone question the need or value of the program, consider the fact that TAA has served not only as a lifesaver but also as an opportunity-creator for individuals to be retrained so they can re-enter the workforce as quickly as possible. Since October 1997 to today, 9,200 Mainers have benefitted from TAA. Nationally, during this same time-frame, almost 1 million people were covered by TAA. In Maine right now, 1,102 people are receiving TAA benefits.

In fact, in Maine it’s been a whole litany of closings from a variety of industries since NAFTA: Carleton Woolen Mills lost 600 jobs, Dexter Shoe Company lost 550 jobs, Kimberly-Clark lost 450 jobs while Mead Paper lost 472 jobs and G.H. Bass footwear lost 355 jobs, as did Cole-Haan Manufacturing, while Eastland Shoe Manufacturing lost 250 jobs and Saucony closed with 110 workers, and just recently, Hathaway Shirts, one of the oldest and last remaining domestic shirt-makers, with 300 workers. Many of these people turned to TAA.

The final provisions of the legislation before us were in question up until the last minute, but they make vital improvements and expansions to the program, including several I have fought for. Specifically, besides consolidating the current TAA and NAFTA-TAA programs into one, more efficient program, the bill includes my proposal to speed up assistance to displaced workers by decreasing the TAA petition time for certification from 60 days to 40 days. Reducing this time by 20 days will allow people to get on with their lives that much quicker.

The bill also includes my proposal to create a new pilot program under the Small Business Administration (SBA) that will test how TAA can help those seeking to start their own business by assisting with development plans without the loss of their TAA benefits. It also allows for customized, employer-sponsored training programs where a worker can learn a specialized skill while on the job.

And the legislation also establishes a performance accountability and reporting system. A concern expressed to me by Maine officials has been that, without taking into account the economic conditions of the states, good systems could be erroneously judged bad due to an economic downturn of a state. By factoring-in this new criteria, we ensure that such a vital component of the overall picture is part of the equation.

Beyond these provisions, the TAA legislation also recognizes the fact that it is not only people but communities

that can be adversely impacted by job loss or plant relocations. It does so by creating a new Office of Community Trade Adjustment at the Economic Development Administration (EDA) that will work closely with state and local officials to develop a strategic plan when a community suffers massive layoffs. The Office can dispense grants that could prove critical in getting these communities back on track.

Moreover, this bill addresses another issue that has created problems in my state this year—the current budget for training assistance. Since last year, Maine has run short of training funds by approximately \$2.7 million, forcing them to apply for five different Department of Labor National Emergency Grants and potentially causing a freeze in retraining assistance. By providing \$300 million in funding, this shortfall will be fully addressed.

And we didn't stop there. Not only does this funding level address State shortfalls, but it also ensures expanded coverage for secondary workers affected by trade. Specifically, under the compromise developed by Senators GRASSLEY and BAUCUS, secondary workers with a direct relationship to the downsizing or closing of a plant will be covered by TAA, while so-called downstream workers covered now under a Statement of Administrative Action as part of the NAFTA-TAA program will also be covered through the SAA's codification.

And, as I stated earlier, bipartisan support also prevailed on the contentious health care issue. Since the end of last year, the health care provision seemed to be the one that would divide us and perhaps even bring down this trade package. Well, Madam President, through the hard work and dedication of many offices, this obstacle has been averted.

The health care compromise included in this agreement provides a 70 percent tax credit for trade-impacted workers to continue their health coverage for themselves and their family. This tax credit is "advanceable" so that people will receive this assistance immediately rather than paying up front to get a tax refund later. The tax credit is also refundable and, as such, provides the full level of the tax credit regardless of whether the individual will owe any taxes that year.

Trade-affected workers can use this tax credit toward the cost of COBRA health coverage from their former employer, if that is available, or they can purchase private health coverage through purchasing groups, state high-risk pools, or other group purchasing arrangements established by the states. Workers can also use the tax credit toward their current private health coverage.

Through these and other provisions, what we have before us today is a bill that recognizes that our desire to trade is dependent on our ability to assist those adversely affected by trade. An expanded TAA program will be part

and parcel of an extension of trade negotiating authority—and American workers will be provided with the assistance they need and deserve.

In that light, as the world grows ever closer, the implications of our trade agreements are more critical—and more magnified—than ever before. As I mentioned earlier, my past opposition to fast-track, due to concerns about the balance between free and fair trade and our enforcement of our trade laws, have been addressed in this bill.

The bottom line is that enforcement is an inseparable component of free and fair trade. If you don't believe me, just look at the record. In the past, when free trade and fair trade have been treated as mutually exclusive, import-sensitive industries in Maine and America were decimated by foreign competitors. Why? Because foreign businesses enjoyed the benefits of a lack of reciprocity in trade agreements—foreign industry subsidies—dumping in the U.S. market—and non-tariff trade barriers. That's why, as a Member of the House in 1986, I lamented that we were running up "the white flag of surrender in the international marketplace."

The "white flag" is perhaps best represented by the shoe industry, which is one that has borne the brunt of our trade policies. In 1986, for example, it experienced an 82 percent import penetration with over 750 million pairs of shoes entering this country annually. Japan, on the other hand, allowed only 1 million pairs of shoes to be imported and Brazil had a 100 percent tariff effectively barring imports. The U.S. industry filed a trade relief petition under section 201, and a five year temporary quota was recommended by the International Trade Commission (ITC), but the Administration did not act on it. In short, we abandoned our workers, our industry and our trade policy in the pursuit of free trade.

And the surrender of our rights under our own trade laws has had serious consequences in the lives of real people. In Maine alone, we lost nearly 15,400 manufacturing jobs since NAFTA's inception, including 2,400 textile jobs, 6,000 leather products jobs, 500 apparel jobs, 3,700 paper and allied products jobs, and 4,800 footwear jobs, excluding rubber footwear, and 5,200 manufacturing jobs so far just this year. We failed those people because we abdicated our responsibility to take a balanced, comprehensive and integrated approach to trade.

That is why I worked to ensure that the ATPA legislation contains at least a 15 year tariff phaseout for rubber footwear, which is supported by the domestic industry. As it was originally written, the ATPA would have signaled the end of our rubber footwear industry by setting a precedent for all other countries. How? By matching this tariff phaseout to the seven years left under the NAFTA, other countries in future agreements would unquestionably seek the same.

During negotiations over NAFTA, the U.S. industry fought to be excluded but grudgingly accepted a 15 year phaseout as a recognition of their import-sensitivity. This is exemplified over the past decades by the decrease we've seen in jobs in this industry from 26,000 workers in the early 1970s to 2,600 today. And I might add, more than a third of those remaining jobs are located in Maine. So to have subjected this industry to the same phase-out date as that required by NAFTA would have put them at yet another debilitating disadvantage by depriving them of another eight years of adjustment. So when it comes to ATPA, to do anything but provide at least the 15 years prescribed under NAFTA would have been unconscionable.

And while we cannot bring back these or other jobs that were lost due to the miscues of the past, we can learn from those miscues and apply the lessons to our present and future actions. We can change our approach at the negotiating table. We can enforce existing trade laws.

In the real world, we have to acknowledge that there are many nations that don't care about labor or environmental standards. And that creates a tilted playing field where it's harder for us to compete. In that regard, this bill makes significant progress on the issues of labor and the environment and I believe it is both a necessary and important distinction that separates this proposal from prior approaches to fast track. The bill before us today not only sets as an overall objective the need to convince our trading partners not to weaken their labor or environmental laws as an inducement to trade, but it also requires the enforcement of existing labor and environmental laws as a principal negotiating objective.

The legislation also recognizes the need to take steps to protect the import sensitive textile and apparel industry. It calls for reducing tariffs on textiles and apparels in other countries to the same or lower levels than in the U.S., reducing or eliminating subsidies to provide for greater market opportunities for U.S. textiles and apparels, and ensuring that WTO member countries immediately fulfill their obligations to provide similar market access for U.S. textiles and apparels as the U.S. does for theirs.

And this legislation includes new negotiating objectives to address the issue of foreign subsidies and market distortions that lead to dumping. As a result, many industries stand to benefit from the adoption of this legislation, including the forest and paper, agriculture, semiconductor, precision manufacturing, and electronic industries of my home state. According to Maine Governor Angus King the fast track approach is, "On balance—beneficial to Maine. There might be some short term problems, but in the long run, we have to participate in the world economy."

And Maine has been participating. From 1989 to 1999, total exports by

Maine companies increased by 137 percent from \$914 million to \$2.167 billion, with the largest industry sector for trade being semiconductors—employing about 2,000 in Maine. The computer and electronics trade, which includes semiconductors, accounted for 33 percent of Maine's exports in 1999, followed by paper and allied products at 17 percent.

The Maine industries that benefit from exports have also seen job gains in the state. From 1994 to 1999, the electrical and electronics industry had a job gain of 2.3 percent and the agriculture, forestry and fishing industry saw a 19 percent increase in jobs. In 2000, Maine's exports supported 84,000 jobs.

And two other Maine industries—the import-sensitive salmon aquaculture industry that was the target of dumping by Chile, and the rubber footwear industry that's been severely impacted by past trade agreements—stand to benefit from commitments I've received from the administration to stand firm on antidumping laws and to negotiate aggressively on their behalf in future agreements.

I have also worked in the Andean Trade Preference Act (ATP) to provide the rubber footwear industry with a comparable tariff provision to that which they received in the NAFTA. The original ATPA further threatened this industry by giving the four Andean nations a tariff phase-out schedule that was only half as long as the 15-year schedule contained in the NAFTA. I am pleased that this legislation now contains this same 15 year phaseout because without this we would be setting a precedent that would be demanded by other countries as well.

These measures and commitments represent a significant strengthening of our resolve and our ability to utilize existing remedies to protect American industries and workers. This comes not a moment too soon, as the success of our economy relies more than ever on fair and freer trade—U.S. exports accounted for one-quarter of U.S. economic growth over the past decade, nearly one in six manufactured products coming off the assembly line goes to a foreign customer, and exports support one of every five manufacturing jobs.

Given these facts, it is understandable concern that the U.S. has been party to only 3 free trade agreements while there are more than 130 worldwide. Since 1995, the WTO has been notified of 90 such agreements while the U.S. only reached one in the trade arena, the Jordan Free Trade Agreement. In contrast, the European Union (EU) has been particularly aggressive, having entered into 27 free trade agreements since 1990 and they are actively negotiating another 15. Perhaps not surprisingly, the Business Roundtable reports that 33 percent of total world exports are covered by EU free trade agreements compared to 11 percent for U.S. agreements.

Why should these facts raise concerns? Because every agreement made without us is a threat to American jobs. Nowhere is this better exemplified than in Chile which signed a free trade agreement with Canada, Argentina and several other nations in 1997.

Since that time, the U.S. has lost one-quarter of Chile's important market, while nations entering into trade agreements more than captured our lost share. According to the National Association of Manufacturers (NAM), this resulted in the loss of more than \$800 million in U.S. exports and 100,000 job opportunities. One specific industry affected was U.S. paper products which accounted for 30 percent of Chile's imports but has since dropped to only 11 percent after the trade agreements were signed.

We need to look to the future of our industries and open doors of opportunity in the global marketplace. In order to do so responsibly, we need to learn every economic lesson possible from the past, and this package provides for not only a study I requested of the economic impact of the past five trade agreements, but also an additional evaluation of any new agreements before TPA is extended.

And we need to make sure that everyone who can benefit from these agreements can get their foot in the door. Small businesses, for example, account for 30 percent of all U.S. goods exported, and in Maine more than 78 percent export, so I am pleased this bill includes my proposals placing small businesses in our principle negotiating objectives.

Small businesses also face the biggest hurdles to engaging in international trade, even as it provides them with best opportunity for growth. So we must ensure their views and needs are addressed in any agreement reached, and I want to thank the chairman and ranking member of the Finance Committee for including my provision to create an Assistant U.S. Trade Representative for Small Business and my proposal requiring the USTR to call for a small business advocate at the WTO in order to ensure that small businesses have advocates at the table during all negotiations.

Finally, the package now includes consultation rights for the House and Senate Committees with oversight of the fishing industry. As the past chair and current ranking member of the Commerce Subcommittee on Oceans and Fisheries, I can tell you that the actions of other countries with regard to fishing plays a crucial role in ensuring our industry has a level playing field on which to compete. Last year this country exported \$11 billion worth of edible and nonedible fish products, and in Maine the industry, which is our 5th leading exporter, generates 26,000 jobs.

The bottom line is international trade is inextricably linked to the economic future of the United States. The adoption of this comprehensive pack-

age will ensure that trade agreements will be pursued in a fair and balanced manner to the benefit of all Americans while also recognizing the need for expanded assistance for those who lose their jobs due to trade, and I urge its adoption. Thank you. I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the time under the quorum call be charged equally against both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SANTORUM. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANTORUM. Madam President, I rise to voice my support for the pending legislation, the trade promotion authority, as well as the TAA, a bill that is before us, the Trade Adjustment Assistance Act. While it is not a perfect bill by any stretch of the imagination, it is important in two respects. It promotes trade and it gives the President the opportunity to craft free trade agreements and open markets.

Pennsylvania, for example, had exports in 2000 to the tune of \$24 billion. We export to over 204 foreign destinations. It is a very important part of Pennsylvania's economy, and it would be vitally important for Pennsylvania if we could open markets particularly with South America. We can begin to structure free trade agreements.

Several South American countries, for example, are very big users of the Port of Philadelphia. Free trade agreements would mean a lot to businesses in Philadelphia, as well as our transportation industry in Pennsylvania, which is a big part of the Pennsylvania economy.

We have tremendous opportunities in Pennsylvania with our manufacturing base, our high-technology industries, our agriculture, to export not just to South America but around the globe.

This is a great opportunity for this administration to structure deals, to bring down tariffs, and to allow us to compete better in the global marketplace.

While I do have some concerns about the Trade Adjustment Assistance Act, I do believe it is important for us to pass a trade adjustment assistance act that does deal with some of the downsides. I think there are a lot of upsides, a lot of good, quality jobs. But there will be some who will lose their jobs, and we need to be there to be helpful, to deal with those who are hurt by the actions of the Federal Government, by trade agreements that result in people losing their jobs.

In the end, there is no question that trade is a net positive for this country. It will improve the quality of life for millions of Americans, and not just for

those who will get better paying jobs because of trade but also people will be able to get better quality goods and less expensive goods as a result of trade with countries around the world.

So this is a win-win, in my opinion. We will be taking care of those who will be hurt and, at the same time, we will be expanding opportunities for millions of people and create a better way of life for our citizenry here at home.

Madam President, with that, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, we are about to begin a series of votes on amendments that have been pending on the trade package. I urge Senators to stay on the floor and to respect the need to discipline ourselves in regard to the amount of time allocated for the votes. Oftentimes, 10- or 15-minute votes turn into half-hour votes. So, please, stay on the floor. We have at least 8, perhaps as many as 10, rollcall votes that will be occurring momentarily.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— S. 2551

Mr. DASCHLE. Prior to that, I urge our colleagues to consider the final piece of business. I am pleased the distinguished chair of the Appropriations Committee is on the floor. He and I have had many conversations with regard to the need to pass the supplemental.

The President has admonished the Senate to complete our work on the supplemental before Memorial Day. I have indicated to Senator BYRD that that would be my desire, to complete our work on the supplemental prior to Memorial Day. And I indicated on the Senate floor earlier today it would be my hope that we could complete our work.

Obviously, there are many pieces of legislation that await us when we return.

So for a lot of reasons, the fact that this money is going primarily to defense and homeland security—we have seen warnings now issued in the last couple of weeks with regard to the need to respond even more consequentially to our homeland security requirements—I think the urgency of the bill is very much in evidence.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the disposition of the trade bill, the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 2551, the Senate supplemental appropriations bill; that there be 10 hours for debate on the bill, equally divided be-

tween the chairman and the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee; that all amendments be relevant to the bill and limited to 30 minutes of debate, equally divided in the usual form, with the amendment debate time counting toward the 10-hour cap; and that upon the disposition of the amendments, the bill be read a third time and passed, without any intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCAIN. Reserving the right to object—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN.—and I will object—first of all, I believe it is the procedure in the Congress for all revenue bills to be passed by the other body first. Isn't that correct? We would wait for the other body to proceed with their completion of the appropriations bill, which they have not done.

Madam President, just last night my office received these two documents: one at 50-some pages and the other 50-some pages, which is an explanatory statement of the recommendations of the Senate committee. We have not had a chance, obviously, to go through that long appropriations bill.

I noticed, among other supplemental appropriations, there is \$5 million for individual quota fishing loans. I knew we were in an emergency here in the country—these fishing loans for halibut, I guess there is a halibut problem up in Alaska of which, unfortunately, the Nation has not been made aware.

But buried in this bill are other “emergencies,” such as the halibut emergency for \$5 million. There are fundamental changes made in the aviation loan program which was passed overwhelmingly by this body for the airlines, which really has nothing to do with supplemental appropriations. There are many other policy changes, as is the practice of the Appropriations Committee—as is the practice.

I am not going to agree to any unanimous consent request. This bill has been over since April. We just got it last night. And you expect us to agree to 10 hours of debate and passing this bill? No. No. It is disgraceful.

We are going to change the way we do business around here. The appropriators are going to understand that there are other Senators who need to be involved when in an emergency supplemental appropriations bill there are policy changes which have nothing to do with any national emergency—whether they be a change to the aviation loan program or whether they be an emergency for halibut.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, let me respond briefly, because I know the distinguished Republican leader would like to make a comment as well.

With regard to the House action, of course, we wouldn't complete our work

on the bill until the House has done its work. We expect that will be done shortly. We have done similar appropriations work on many occasions in the past. We need to move forward.

As I said, there is an urgency to many of the provisions of this legislation. We are talking about defense and homeland security in particular.

I would also note that this bill is subject to amendment. Senators wishing to offer amendments would be entitled to do so.

I am disappointed we were not able to get the unanimous consent agreement. I think it does again delay our chances to complete this work and to get it done in a way that accommodates the President's request and our appreciation for the urgency of addressing this work.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, we received this request at approximately 5:28 this afternoon. I will make a couple of points with regard to the legislation, some of it with regard to what Senator MCCAIN was just saying.

I understand the Senate bill was reported last night and we were only able to get a copy of the measure earlier today. Senator MCCAIN and others are going through the bill to see exactly what its present condition is. It is obviously in the legislative process. It is different from what the President had requested. It is different from what the House passed. Therefore, we need to make sure we know exactly the present condition of what is in the bill.

For instance, the President asked for this supplemental for defense and homeland security, about \$27.1 billion. The House-passed bill that we have not yet received is at approximately \$29.4 billion. This bill is approximately \$31 billion.

Mr. MCCAIN. Will the Senator yield for a question on that?

Mr. LOTT. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MCCAIN. Isn't it the Senator's recollection that when this side of the aisle was in the majority, the other side always insisted that the appropriations bills come over from the House before the Senate would be allowed to act? Is that not the recollection of the Senator?

Mr. LOTT. I know in the past my colleagues on the other side insisted we wait on the House appropriations bill in order to provide a defense of germaneness. So that has been the practice; the Senator is correct.

I understand we are going to get the House bill later tonight, but it may be, actually, in the morning before we get it. I also understand that no report was filed with the bill, although there is some sort of explanatory statement. Perhaps that will be helpful and maybe that is intended to be in place of the report. That is a concern, too.

The consent that was propounded asked for debate and amendment limits before Members even really knew what